



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/006,267	12/03/2001	Alain Jean Falya	448/9-1621	2061
<div>7590 William J. Sapone, Esq. Coleman Sudol Sapone 714 Colorado Avenue Bridgeport, CT 06605-1601</div>				
<div>05/12/2010</div>				
<div>EXAMINER GREENE, DANIEL LAWSON</div>				
<div>ART UNIT 3694</div>				
<div>PAPER NUMBER</div>				
<div>MAIL DATE 05/12/2010</div>				
<div>DELIVERY MODE PAPER</div>				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/006,267

Applicant(s)

FALYS ET AL.

Examiner

DANIEL L. GREENE JR.

Art Unit

3694

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 February 2010.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15, 17-26, 30-32, 47 and 48 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-15, 17 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 18-26, 30-32, 47 and 48 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ ~~Notice of Informal Patent Application~~
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicants 2/4/2010 response to the previous 8/4/2009 Non-Final Office actions has been considered and entered. Claims 1-15 and 17-26, 30-32, 47 and 48 are pending with claims 1-15 and 17 being withdrawn. An action on the merits of pending claims 18-26, 30-32, 47 and 48 follows.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed 8/4/2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
3. Applicant's arguments, see pages 10-14, filed 2/4/2010, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 18-26, 30-32 and 48 under 35 USC 103 have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made as set forth below.
4. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. **The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:**

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6. Claims 18-26, 30-32, 47 and 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,708,828 to Coleman.

NOTE: the limitation "invoice" has been considered as being nothing more than a document containing specific information or data, for example, an itemized bill for goods sold or services provided, containing individual prices, the total charge, and the terms, however, such is nothing more than data. In this regard, it is immaterial that the claims recite an "invoice" as such is nothing more than data. Accordingly, Coleman is directly applicable to processing invoices as well as any other data that one desires to process.

Regarding claims 18 and 47 Coleman discloses an invoice (data) routing system (See, Fig. 2B and Fig. 3) and method for routing an invoice (input data) over a network having a transmitter, a router and a receiver, said method comprising:

transmitting (200) an invoice from said transmitter to said router;


receiving (200) said invoice at said router;

electronically converting said received invoice into an intermediate invoice in a form having predetermined characteristics determined in dependence on an identity of a sender of the invoice (214);


electronically processing said intermediate invoice within said router into a secondary invoice in a form selected in relation to an identity of a party being invoiced (216); and

sending said secondary invoice from said router to a pre-selected destination (218) in, for example, the abstract, figures, etc.

Figure 2B clearly discloses applicant's invention as shown below. One can easily see the similarities by the comparison of Figure 1 of the instant invention.



See also Col. 5 lines 25-32



“the present invention comprises an improved system and method for converting data between different formats or types. The present invention converts data to a pre-defined generic data object or generic data type and then converts data from this generic type to the new format. This simplifies the conversion process.”

Regarding claims 19 and 48 and the limitation storing a plurality of input invoice mapping definitions and selecting an invoice mapping definition from said stored input invoice mapping definitions for use in said electronic processing of said received invoice, see for example, the abstract “The data conversion process begins by first defining a **complete data map of the input and output data environments**, as well as zero or more intermediate environments... When an execute command is received, the

data conversion system and method accesses data from the first input environment, i.e., **accesses data from the storage medium storing the data to be converted**, and converts the data from the first input data environment to data having a pre-defined generic data type. “(emphasis added)

. **Regarding claim 20** and the limitation storing a plurality of output invoice mapping definitions and selecting an output invoice mapping definition from said stored output invoice mapping definitions for electronic processing of said received invoice, again, see the abstract wherein “**a complete data map of the input and output data environments**” is made. Further, “Once data has been converted to the generic data object, the **associations are executed to convert** the data from the pre-defined generic data type **to the output data using the second data format** (emphasis added). See also Col. 3, lines 5+.

Regarding claim 21 and the limitation storing said intermediate invoice in a storage location and retrieving said intermediate invoice from said storage location before electronic processing of said intermediate invoice, it must be understood that this limitation is inherent to the system because if the intermediate invoice (data) was NOT stored within the system then it could not be worked upon. In other words, the limitation “storing” does not connote any particular type of “storing” and Coleman at least stores said intermediate data within a buffer so that it can be converted to the secondary format.

Regarding claim 22 and the limitation storing said received invoice in a received invoice archive, see for example, Col. 4 lines 53 and 54 wherein it is understood that the limitation “storage medium” reads on an “archive”.

Regarding claim 23 and the limitation wherein the electronic processing of said received invoice comprises determining a source of said received invoice from a buffer location and selecting an input invoice mapping definition in dependence on the source thereof, see for example, Col. 3 lines 24-40, wherein it is understood that the mapping definitions are defined for each input source so that the system can perform its functions.

Regarding claim 24, Coleman inherently performs the claimed limitation because it is applicable to multiple invoices and data conversions. That is, claim 24 merely claims that the process is being performed on a plurality of documents received together. It does not matter when the invoices are received as Coleman performs its intended conversion regardless. See also Col. 7, lines 11-14, wherein “batch automation” is disclosed.

Regarding claims 25 and the limitation wherein the electronic processing of said intermediate invoice comprises obtaining an invoice destination identification therefrom and selecting an output invoice mapping definition in dependence on the invoice destination identification, see for example, Col. 3 lines 24-40 “the user also defines a complete data map of the **output** data environment” (emphasis added)

Regarding claims 26 and the limitation wherein the output processing means is configured to send the secondary invoices to buffer means selected in dependence on the invoice destination identification, see for example, Col. 5, lines 10-25 “the converted output data is stored in a destination medium (reads on buffer)”.

Regarding claim 27 and the limitation wherein the processing of said received invoice comprises using the selected input invoice mapping definitions to perform a data

format conversion on data derived from said received invoice, see for example, Col. 3 lines 5+ wherein it is understood that in order to perform the data conversion, the user must first define a complete data map.

Regarding claim 28 and the limitation wherein the electronic processing of said received invoice includes adding data to said data derived from said received invoice, see for example, Col. 4, lines 10-28 wherein it is understood that the “MapTo” commands are indeed data added to said data which is used to determine the data's specific identity/purpose/etc. Furthermore it is notoriously old and well known to add a time date stamp to information to show when it was received.

Regarding claim 29 and the limitation wherein the processing of said intermediate invoice comprises using the selected output invoice mapping definition to perform data format conversions on data derived from said intermediate invoice, see for example, Col. 5, lines 10-25, “Once data has been converted to the generic data object, the associations or MapTo commands are executed to convert the data from the pre-defined generic data type to the output data using the second data format. “

Regarding claim 30 and the limitation wherein the received and transmitted invoices are comprised of data files, see the first line of the abstract.

Regarding claim 31 and the limitation wherein said intermediate invoice comprises data placed in tables and stored in a database, see for example, Col. 3 lines 41-57.

Regarding claim 32 and the limitation wherein each table contains data from a plurality of received invoices and each received invoice provides data for a plurality of

tables of said database, again, see for example, Col. 3 lines 41-57 wherein a plurality of databases are set forth as well as separating the data into separate databases.

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.
8. Kumar teaches the addition of dynamic and static data
9. Bucklin discusses the use of UPCs to automatically enter data
10. McCarthy also teaches invoice processing in a computerized environment
11. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DANIEL L. GREENE JR. whose telephone number is (571)272-6876. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thur.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James P. Trammell can be reached on (571) 272-6712. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

13. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/D. L. G./
Examiner, Art Unit 3694
2010-05-08

/James P Trammell/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3694